

TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS

SHARED SERVICES

2015-16

2015-16

**SHARED SERVICES
EDUCATOR EVALUATION PROCESS AND GUIDELINES**

Shared Services' Educator Evaluation Plan shall be based on Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development Guidelines.

This outline of the components of Shared Services' Educator Evaluation Plan is based on the SEED Guidelines:

- 45% Student Outcomes
- 40% Teacher Practice
- 10% Stakeholder/Parent Feedback
- 5% Whole School Learning Indicator

Teacher Evaluation and Development

Purpose and Rationale

- The purpose of the evaluation model is to fairly and accurately evaluate teacher performance and to help each teacher strengthen his or her practice to improve student learning.
- Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT) 2010 defines effective teaching practice throughout the career continuum of educators from pre-service to experienced teaching status in the following six domains:
 - Content and Essential Skills
 - Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning;
 - Planning for Active Learning;
 - Instruction for Active Learning;
 - Assessment for Learning
 - Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership.

Guiding Principles:

- Strengthen individual and collective practices in order to improve student growth
- Consider multiple, standard-based measures of performance
- Foster continuing collaborative dialogue around teaching and learning in order to increase student academic growth and development.
- Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth
- Connect professional learning to the outcomes of the evaluation process.

Orientation:

Shared Services will offer an annual teacher evaluation and support orientation to all staff members whose performance is being evaluated that year prior to October 15th. Orientation will include information and materials on the evaluation process and will provide an opportunity to meet and review these materials. Ongoing professional development in this area may occur on campus or through Education Connection.

Evaluator Training:

Evaluators will attend CSDE training workshops offered through Education Connection. Evaluators will demonstrate proficiency on an on-going basis by reviewing and discussing data collected after conducting walk-throughs and observations.

Evaluation Framework –Components

- **Teacher Practice Related Indicators**

- Observation of teacher performance and practice (40%) as defined in the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 and the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015.
- Stakeholder/Parent feedback (10%) on teacher practice.

- **Student Related Indicators**

- Student growth and development (45%) as determined by the teacher's student learning objectives (SLOs).
- Whole-school measure (5%) of student learning as determined by the aggregate rating (45%) for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrator's evaluation rating.

Teacher Evaluation Process:

- Orientation – Prior to October 15th
- Goal Setting and Planning –October 15th thru November 15th
 - Teacher Reflection and Goal Setting
 - Goal Setting Conference: During the Goal Setting Conference, at least 1, but no more than 4 Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are determined and Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) are established for each goal. If 1 goal is established, multiple IAGDs are required. IAGDs will be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator. Further, there will be agreement on the balance of the weighting standardized and non-standardized indicators for the 45% component when standardized indicators are available.
 - Evidence collection and review - Ongoing

- Mid-Year Check-In – January and February
 - Reflection and preparation
 - Mid-Year Conference: Opportunity is provided for revisions to the strategies or approach being used and/or for teachers and evaluators to mutually agree upon mid-year adjustments of student learning goal(s), if warranted.

- End-of-Year Summative Review – Completed June 30th
 - Teacher self-assessment
 - Opportunity is provided for the teacher to collect evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives and submit to evaluator.
 - End-of-Year Summative Conference
 - Rating: Determination of a summative rating is aligned to one of the four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Effective, Developing and Below Standard. Determination of summative rating aligns with the Guidelines, including: Rating in each of the four categories, determination of “outcomes” rating composed of the indicators of student growth and development rating (45%) and the whole-school student learning indicator rating (5%). Determination of a “practice rating” is composed of the performance and practice rating (40%) and the stakeholder/parent feedback rating (10%). A combination of the outcomes rating and the performance rating will result in a summative rating. In undertaking this step, the evaluator will assign a “**summative rating**” category of Exemplary, Effective, Developing, or Below Standard.
 - 2.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation

Shared Services shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one. Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if the educator receives at least two sequential “effective” or “exemplary” ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of the novice teacher’s career. A “below standard” rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of “developing” in year two and two sequential “effective” ratings in years three and four. A post-tenure teacher shall generally be deemed ineffective if the teacher receives at least two sequential “developing” ratings or one “below standard” rating at any time. At the request of a district or employee, the State Department of Education or a third-party entity approved by the SDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both exemplary and below standard ratings) to determine a final summative rating.
 - If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating it may be revised before September 15th the following year or when state test data becomes available.

Evaluator

- The evaluator of all teachers shall be the Executive Director of Shared Services. The Executive Director supervises all teachers. There are no intermediate administrators within Shared Services.
- The evaluators shall complete CSDE training through Education Connection and demonstrate on-going proficiency through discussions held after walk-throughs. These calibration exercises will be held during Administrators' Council Meetings with building level administrators at Regional District #7, which the Shared Services' Executive Director participates in.

Evaluation-Informed Professional Growth Plans

- All teachers will have a Professional Growth Plan that is co-created with mutual agreement between the teacher and his or her evaluator. Shared Services shall provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

- Teachers whose performance is rated Developing or Below Standard shall have an individual teacher improvement and remediation plan designed in consultation with the teacher and his/her union representative. The plan will; (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of effective or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

- Shared Services' Observation Model is standards based and aligned with the Connecticut Core of Teaching 2014.
- Observation protocol involves multiple in-class visits throughout the year, including a combination of formal, informal, announced and unannounced observations.
- Novice Year 1 and Novice Year 2 teachers receive at least 3 formal in-class observations. 2 of the 3 include a pre-conference and all include a post-conference and timely verbal

and written feedback. This feedback will include email communication and/or a hard copy letter presented to the teacher/specialist.

- Teachers who receive a performance rating of **Below Standard** or **Developing** receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual support plan, but no fewer than 3

formal in-class observations. 2 of the 3 must include a pre-conference and all include a post conference and timely verbal and written feedback. This feedback will include email communication and/or a hard copy letter presented to the teacher/specialist.

- Teachers who receive and maintain an annual summative performance evaluation designation of **Effective** or **Exemplary** (or the equivalent annual summative ratings in a pre-existing district evaluation plan) and who are not first or second year teachers shall be evaluated with a minimum of 1 formal in-class observation no less than once every 3 years and 3 informal in-class observations in all other years and one review of practice shall be completed every year. Teachers with an effective or exemplary designation may receive a formal observation if an informal observation or review of practice results in a concern regarding a teacher's practice. All observations shall be followed with timely feedback.
- Student and Educator Support Specialists and the evaluator (administrator) shall agree to appropriate venues for observations (i.e. PPTs) and an appropriate rubric for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the school year. These observations will be based on standards when available. Examples include but are not limited to: observing student and educator support specialist staff working with small groups of children, working with adults, providing professional development, working with families and/or working with teams of teachers.

****Four-Level Matrix System**

Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating					
Student Related Indicators Rating		Exemplary	Effective	Developing	Below Standard
	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Effective	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Effective	Exemplary	Effective	Effective	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Developing	Effective	Developing	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

Stakeholder/Parent Feedback (10%)

Feedback from stakeholders will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice. Stakeholder surveys will be conducted for all individual Shared Services staff. Surveys of stakeholders will include but not be limited to principals, assistant principals and department heads. Surveys will be utilized to help determine stakeholder feedback ratings.

Schools within the Shared Services system that conduct parent feedback surveys may also be used in determining this indicator.

Shared Services may use either the stakeholder feedback surveys or the individual school's parent feedback surveys or an amalgamation of both.

The four performance levels are as follows:

Exemplary: Took a leadership role

Effective: Volunteered and actively participated

Developing: Participated when asked

Below Standard: Did not participate or resisted participating

Student Growth and Development (45%)

- 45% of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on attainment of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), using multiple indicators of academic growth and development to measure success.
- The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development is developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and his or her evaluator at the beginning of the year (or mid-year for semester classes).
- One half or 22.5% of the IAGDs used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects **or** another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. The state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, a non-standard indicator. **
For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval.
- A minimum of 1 non-standardized indicator is used in rating 22.5% of IAGDs. The non-standardized indicators will be rated against a rubric.

Whole School Learning Indicator (5%)

- **Whole School Learning Indicator**
Shared Services staff's performance ratings will include the whole school learning indicator rating for whatever school they are placed in for the majority of their time within the Shared Services system.

The Whole School Student Learning Indicator shall be among 4 performance levels.

Summative Performance Levels Will Be Defined as Follows:

- Exemplary – Took a leadership role
- Effective – Volunteered and actively participated
- Developing – Participated when asked
- Below Standard – Did not participate or resisted participating

Summative Scoring:

- The summative rating will be determined using the three-step process as defined by SEED Guidelines.
 1. Calculate a **Teacher Practice Related Indicator Rating** by combining the Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Score and the Stakeholder/Parent Feedback score.
 2. Calculate a **Student Related Indicators Rating** by combining the Student Growth and Development score and the Whole-School Learning score.

*** Use the Four-Level Summative Matrix (SEED) to determine Summative Rating*

Eligible Teachers and Alternative Measures:

Student surveys will not be applicable and appropriate for all teachers. Professional judgment in determining whether student surveys should be included in a particular teacher's summative rating will be used.

Support and Development:

Teacher effectiveness or ineffectiveness shall be defined utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one.

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if the educator receives at least two sequential "effective" or "exemplary" ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of the novice teacher's career. A "below standard" rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher's career, assuming a pattern of growth of "developing" in year two and two sequential "effective" ratings in years three and four.

A post-tenure teacher shall generally be deemed ineffective if the teacher receives at least two sequential “developing” ratings or one “below standard” rating at any time.

Improvement and Remediation Plans:

Shared Services will create support plans for individual teacher improvement and remediation for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard. These plans will be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her union representative. Each plan will indicate resources, timelines and indicators of success.

Dispute-Resolution:

Shared Services will create a plan for dispute resolution for teachers whose performance designation is in question. Every effort will be made to find a resolution between the educator and the evaluator.

Dispute resolutions meetings will be conducted in consultation with the teacher and his/her union representative. The Committee for Shared Services shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. The Executive Director is the final decision maker when a resolution cannot be reached.

Regarding the aforementioned subjects, this provision is to be utilized in accordance with the specified processes and parameters regarding objectives, evaluation period, feedback, and professional development contained in the document entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation” dated 2012.

Professional Learning:

Shared Services will provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and targeted professional development based on areas of need.